

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing and responsive to item 3 of the Action, the dependency of claim 9 is changed from claim "3" (canceled in the last response) to claim --1--.

Further, claim 18 has been amended to change the dependency thereof from claim "12", canceled in the last response, to claim 10.

Furthermore, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended, in a similar fashion, to clarify a feature of the invention, that a reset period includes first and second erase discharge periods performing erase discharges to erase wall charges accumulated in cells under specified conditions, as are respectively recited in claims 1 and 10.

No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

ITEM 2: WITHDRAWAL OF DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 5 AND 6

The withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is acknowledged and greatly appreciated.

ITEM 3: CLAIM OBJECTIONS

As noted above, claims 9 and 18 have been amended as well as several other claims to correct for an earlier oversight of not amending various dependent claims in view of the cancellation of claims 3 and 12 upon the incorporation thereof into independent claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Accordingly, the objections to claims 9 and 18 are submitted to be overcome and therefore the objections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

ITEM 5: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4-7, 9-10, 13-14 AND 18 UNDER 35 USC 102(b) OVER WEBER IN VIEW OF TOKUNAGA

This rejection is procedurally incorrect, since presented as an anticipation rejection (§ 102(b))--but then asserting reliance on the combination of Weber and Tokunaga--necessarily contrary to an anticipation rejection and, instead, presumably invoking an obviousness rejection

under 35 USC § 103. Moreover, the preceding item 4 of the Action sets forth a quotation of 35 USC § 103(a) and the heading preceding item 3 likewise refers to "claim rejections--35 USC § 103."

Item 5 of the final Office Action is a substantially verbatim repetition of portions of items 3 and 6 of the first Office Action. (See attached copies of the two Office Actions, in which various sections of the rejections of items 3, 5, and 6 are labeled A through I, are now found reproduced as sections A' through I' of the rejections of items 5 and 6, pages 2-4, of the final Office Action.)

Applicants accordingly reassert the arguments of the intervening response to the first Office Action against these verbatim repeated portions of the first Office Action, now reproduced in item 5 of the FINAL Office Action.

ITEM 6: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 11 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 USC § 103(a) OVER WEBER IN VIEW OF TOKUNAGA AND MATSUMOTO ET AL.

This rejection is a combination of portions of items 5 and 6 of the first Office Action. Again with reference to the attached, annotated copies of the two Office Actions, portion F of item 5 is reproduced as portion F' of item 6, portion C of item 6 of the first Office Action is incorporated as portion C' in paragraph 6 of the final Office Action and, finally, portions G, H, and I of item 5 of the first Office Action are reproduced as portions G', H' and I' in item 6 of the final Office Action. Further, portion C of item 6 of the first Office Action is reproduced as portion C' of item 5 of the final Office Action at page 4 and, again, as part C' of item 6 at page 5 of the final Office Action.

Applicants accordingly reassert the arguments of the first Office Action against these verbatim repeated portions thereof now reproduced in item 6 of the FINAL Office Action.

SUPPLEMENTAL ARGUMENTS BY APPLICANTS IN SUPPORT OF PATENTABILITY

The Present Invention

In a plasma display driving method in accordance with the present invention, the reset period performing an erase discharge to erase wall charges in the cell includes a second erase discharge period in which a first erase pulse, whose application voltage continuously changes

with time in a positive direction, is applied to a first electrode and a second erase pulse, whose application voltage continuously changes with time in a negative direction, is applied to a second electrode. By applying the first and second erase pulses to the first and second electrodes, respectively, weak wall charges accumulated (and remaining) in the OFF cell can be erased during the second erase discharge period.

WEBER

Weber (USP 5,745,086) discloses a plasma panel in which two pulses are applied during the reset period. However, Weber differs significantly from the present invention, in that the first and second pulses of Weber are not able to erase weak wall charges in the OFF cell. The present invention, as claimed, thus, clearly, patentably distinguishes over Weber.

TOKUNAGA

Tokunaga (USP 5,982,344) teaches a technique of applying a long rising pulse (RPx) and a long falling pulse (Rpy). However, taking into account that the period for applying long rising/falling pulses of Tokunaga corresponds to the second erase discharge period of the present invention, the result is that there is no first erase discharge period, as employed by the present invention. Accordingly, the present invention patentably distinguishes over Tokunaga.

Furthermore, in Tokunaga, long rising/falling pulses are write pulses, which serve to accumulate wall charges in the cell, and not erase pulses, which function erase weak wall charges in the cell in accordance with the present invention.

THE PRESENT INVENTION PATENTABLY DISTINGUISHES OVER THE REFERENCES RELIED UPON

Therefore, the present invention patentably distinguishes over both Weber and Tokunaga, not only as to the respective functions of pulses applied during the reset period but also based on technological principles. Even if Weber and Tokunaga were properly combinable, which applicants respectfully dispute, weak wall charges accumulated in an OFF cell cannot be erased by the combination of the references, as in the present invention.

Both of Tokunaga and Matsumoto et al. (JP 10003281A) fail to disclose that the reset

period includes first and second erase discharge periods. Furthermore, Tokunaga and Matsumoto have no description of a reset period including a second erase discharge period in which a first erase pulse, whose application voltage continuously changes with time in a positive direction, is applied to a first electrode and a second erase pulse, whose application voltage continuously changes with time in a negative direction, is applied to a second electrode.

Accordingly, the present invention patentably distinguishes over the proposed combination of Weber, Matsumoto and Tokunaga even if that combination were proper, which applicants respectfully dispute.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the references of record and, their being no other objections or rejections, that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 14, 2003

By: 

H.J. Staas

Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501